

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

LERAY S. GIBSON,	)	CASE NO. 5:16-cv-1357
	)	
	)	
PLAINTIFF,	)	JUDGE SARA LIOI
	)	
vs.	)	MEMORANDUM OPINION AND
	)	ORDER
	)	
TIM CASEY,	)	
	)	
	)	
DEFENDANT.	)	

Plaintiff LeRay S. Gibson brings this *pro se* action against defendant Tim Casey, and moves to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2). Plaintiff appears to be seeking damages in connection with discrimination relating to Section 8 housing, however, the complaint consists of a series of sentence fragments and grievances regarding the housing that are not reasonably intelligible to the Court. Further, the Court cannot discern any allegations in the complaint regarding defendant Tim Casey (“Casey”).

Federal district courts are required, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), to dismiss before service any *in forma pauperis* action that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief. “[T]o survive scrutiny under §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), ‘a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 471

(6th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 173 L. Ed. 2d 868 (2009)).

Although the standard of review for *pro se* pleadings is liberal, principles requiring generous construction of *pro se* pleadings are not without limits. *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). *Pro se* plaintiffs are still required to meet basic pleading requirements, and courts are not required to conjure allegations on their behalf. *See Erwin v. Edwards*, 22 F. App'x 579, 580 (6th Cir. 2001).

Even liberally construed, plaintiff's complaint does not set forth allegations stating a plausible federal claim against defendant Casey. Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. (Doc. No. 2.) The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 26, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**HONORABLE SARA LIOI**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**